

REMARKS

By this Amendment, claims 1, 4, 12, 18, 21, and 26-27 are amended to merely clarify the recited subject matter. No new matter has been added.

The Office Action indicated that claims 3-6, 8-17 and 20-26 contain allowable subject matter. By this Amendment, claims 4, 12, 21 and 26 have been rewritten in independent format. Thus, claims 4-6, 12, 21 and 26 are allowable.

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 2, 7, 18 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §102 based on Buskens et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,192,250; hereafter "Buskens"). The Office Action also rejected claims 27 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §102 based on Ghisler (U.S. Pat. 5,926,755). Applicants traverse the rejections because the cited references, analyzed individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all the features recited in the rejected claims. For example, Buskens, analyzed individually or in combination with Ghisler, fails to teach or suggest a method of controlling a multicall in a telecommunications system over a transmission path between a telecommunications network and a subscriber terminal, the method comprising "setting up any new call in an existing multicall, according to a criterion, either by (i) setting up said new call on a new bearer, or (ii) setting up said new call on an existing bearer such that said existing bearer is shared by at least two calls", as recited in independent claim 1 and its dependent claims 2 and 7. Similarly, Buskens, analyzed individually or in combination with Ghisler, fails to teach or suggest a telecommunications system comprising an arrangement for controlling a multicall over a transmission path between a telecommunications network and a subscriber terminal, "the network being configured to set up a new call in an existing multicall, according to a criterion, either by (i) setting up said new call on a new bearer, or (ii) setting up said new call on an existing bearer such that said existing bearer is shared by at least two calls", as recited in independent claim 18 and its dependent claim 19.

Buskens merely discloses a cluster mobile switching center that can support multi-connections calls, which is a requirement for third generation systems. However, Buskens fails to teach a multi-call in a telecommunication system between a telecommunications network and a subscriber terminal. On the contrary, in Buskens, the term "multi-connection" refers to the plurality of individual connections between the switching center and a plurality of user terminals.

Even assuming, *arguendo*, that the term "multi-connection call", as it is used in Buskens, were understood as a multi-call between telecommunications network and a subscriber terminal, Buskens would actually teach away from the present invention. In other words, Buskens merely teaches to use a plurality of individual connections (bearers) to

implement what it refers to as a “multi-connection call”, whereas, according to the present invention, in a multicall, a new call can be set up on an existing bearer (e.g., a connection already used by at least one existing call) such that the existing bearer is shared by at least two calls.

Thus, Buskens fails to teach setting up any new call in an existing multi-call, according a criterion, either by setting up the new call on a new bearer or setting up the new call on an existing bearer such that the existing bearer is shared by at least two calls.

Therefore, the subject matter of independent claims 1 and 18 and their respective dependent claims is not anticipated by or obvious from the teachings of Buskens.

Similarly, Ghisler, analyzed individually or in combination with Buskens, fails to teach or suggest a subscriber terminal for a telecommunications system “being capable of having a multicall over a transmission path between a telecommunications network and a subscriber terminal, the terminal being configured to be able to indicate at a setup stage of a new call in an existing multicall whether said new call is set up on a new bearer or on an existing bearer such that said existing bearer will be shared by at least two calls”, as recited in independent claim 27 and its dependent claim 28.

Ghisler merely discloses a method and an arrangement for conducting multiple calls simultaneously. Ghisler explicitly teaches that a first and a second call are set up on different traffic channels. Because each new call is always set up on a different traffic channel, there is no need to configure a terminal to be able to indicate at a set up state of a new call in an existing multi-call whether such a new call is set up on a new bearer or on an existing bearer such that the existing bearer will be shared by at least two calls. Therefore, Ghisler, analyzed individually or in combination with Buskens, fails to teach or suggest a subscriber terminal for a telecommunications system being capable of having a multicall over a transmission path between a telecommunications network and a subscriber terminal, the terminal being configured to be able to indicate at a setup stage of a new call in an existing multicall whether said new call is set up on a new bearer or on an existing bearer such that said existing bearer will be shared by at least two calls as recited in independent claim 27 and its dependent claim 28.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, Applicant requests issuance of a notice of allowance indicating the allowability of all pending claims. If anything further is necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP

By: 

Christine H. McCarthy

Reg. No.: 41,844

Tel. No.: (703) 905-2143

Fax No.: (703) 905-2500

CHM/eed
P.O. Box 10500
McLean, VA 22102
(703) 905-2000